

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed March 14, 2005. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-20 were pending in this Application. Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Claims 1-2, 8-10, 14-16 and 18-19 have been amended to advance prosecution of this application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-20 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Matthew Lennig et al. ("*Lennig*"). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that the cited art does not teach all of the elements of the claims as amended.

For example, amended independent Claim 1 recites:

A method for providing automated directory assistance, comprising:
initiating a multi-stage directory assistance dialog with a user;
prompting the user for a directory assistance utterance in accordance
with a current stage of the multi-stage dialog;
recording a user utterance in response to the prompt;
gathering one or more directory assistance search parameters from the
user utterance;
determining whether a user directory assistance query may be
completed based on gathered directory assistance search parameters;
repeating the prompting operation until either the user directory
assistance query may be completed or a determination that a user utterance
satisfies an error condition;
displaying gathered directory assistance search parameters on an
operator terminal and forwarding one or more recorded user utterances to an
operator for playback in response to a failure to obtain the directory assistance
search parameters needed to complete the user directory assistance query;
determining whether a particular user utterance received prior to a user
utterance satisfying an error condition is a generic utterance or a non-generic
utterance; and
if the particular user utterance is a non-generic utterance, playing the
particular user utterance for the operator.

Lennig fails to disclose at least the following limitations:

- determining whether a particular user utterance received prior to a user utterance satisfying an error condition is a generic utterance or a non-generic utterance; and
- if the particular user utterance is a non-generic utterance, playing the particular user utterance for the operator.

Lennig discloses a system for providing fully or partially automated directory assistance. Various user responses may cause the automated directory assistance system to hand a call off to a human operator. (Col. 6, line 34 to col. 7, line 47). In such situations, “when the unit hands off to a human operator . . . , the operator’s screen will display whatever data the automatic system has managed to determine from the caller and the recording of the caller’s responses will be replayed.” (Col. 7, lines 29-34). Thus, *Lennig* teaches replaying the caller’s responses to an operator after a call has been handed off from the automated system to the operator.

However, *Lennig* does not teach or suggest anything that could be equated with determining whether a caller’s utterance is a generic utterance or a non-generic utterance, much less determining whether a particular user utterance received prior to a user utterance satisfying an error condition is a generic utterance or a non-generic utterance. In addition, *Lennig* fails to teach or suggest playing a user utterance if the particular user utterance is a non-generic utterance. Thus, *Lennig* fails to disclose “determining whether a particular user utterance received prior to a user utterance satisfying an error condition is a generic utterance or a non-generic utterance; and if the particular user utterance is a non-generic utterance, playing the particular user utterance for the operator,” as specifically recited in amended Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of amended Claim 1, together with Claims 2-7 that depend from Claim 1. In addition, for analogous reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of amended independent Claims 8 and 15, together with Claims 9-14 and 16-20 that depend from Claims 8 and 15.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have now made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the amendments and remarks set forth above. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims as amended.

Applicants believe there are no fees due at this time, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2148 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicants' attorney at 512.322.2689.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorney for Applicants



Eric M. Grabski
Reg. No. 51,749

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

CUSTOMER ACCOUNT NO. **31625**

512.322.2689

512.322.8320 (fax)

Date: June 14, 2005